

Appl. No. 10/656,137
Amendment dated October 25, 2004
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2004

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheets of drawings include a change to Figures 13-14. These sheets of Figures 13-14 replace the original sheets of Figures 13-14.

Attachment: two (2) replacement sheets

REMARKS

In the August 9, 2004 Office Action, all of the claims stand rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the August 9, 2004 Office Action, Applicants have amended the specification and claims 1 and 17 as indicated above. None of the claims are being amended by the current Amendment. Thus, claims 1-22 are pending, with claims 1 and 17 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Drawings

Applicants have noticed typographical errors in the drawings as filed. Accordingly, Applicants have filed herewith a Request for Approval of Proposed Drawing Corrections. Specifically, Applicants have corrected the reference numbers "129c" and "129d." Thus, Applicants believe that no new matter has been added by the correction to Figures 13 and 14. Applicants believe that the drawings now comply with 37 CFR §1.83(a).

Specification

Applicants have noticed typographical errors in the specification as filed. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the specification to correct the typographical errors as provided above. Applicants believe that the specification is now correct and complies with 37 CFR §1.71 and 37 CFR §1.75(d)(1).

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

On pages 2-3 of the Office Action, claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,308,019 to Karlsson {"Karlsson patent"}. In response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 17 to clearly define the present invention over the prior art of record. Clearly, the Karlsson patent does not anticipate or suggest the arrangement of claims 1 and 17 as now amended.

In particular, independent claims 1 and 17 have been amended to clearly recite that the spool and the spool driving mechanism are capable of functioning in cooperation with each other without the outer plate portion or the decorative cover portion being attached to the attachment frame or the installation frame. Clearly, this structure is *not* disclosed or suggested by the Karlsson patent or any other prior art of record.

The Office Action asserts that the side covers 4 and 5 and the mounting plate 11 correspond to the outer plate portions of claim 1 and the decorative cover portion of claim 17. Applicants believe, however, that the spool 7 and the spool driving mechanism 10 of the Karlsson patent *cannot* function in cooperation with each other without the side plates 4, 5, and the mounting plate 11. As clearly seen in Figure 1 and described in column 2, lines 55-59 of the Karlsson patent, the spool driving mechanism 10 is disposed between the mounting plate 11 and the side plate 4, the spool driving mechanism 10 being coupled to the spindle 12 that is attached to the mounting plate 11. Thus, it would be impossible for the spool 7 and the spool mechanism 10 to function in cooperation with each other if the fishing reel did not have the side plate 4 and the mounting plate 11.

It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each and every element of the claim within the reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 17 as now amended are not anticipated by the prior art of record. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Moreover, Applicants believe that dependent claims 2-16 and 18-22 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claims 1 and 17, and are therefore allowable for the reasons stated above. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not anticipate the independent claims 1 and 17, neither does the prior art anticipate the dependent claims 2-16 and 18-22.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Prior Art Citation


In the Office Action, additional prior art references were made of record. Applicants believe that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-22 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/656,137
Amendment dated October 25, 2004
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2004

Respectfully submitted,


Kiyoe Kabashima
Reg. No. 54,874

SHINJYU GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444

Dated: Oct 25, 2004

G:\10-OCT04-MTSN-US020331A Amendment.doc